



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

than have heretofore been used, if the Akkadists wish to win their points. From several indirect statements, however, one is led to believe that Delitzsch is gradually drawing nearer and nearer to the Anti-Akkadist school of Halévy. His remarks are still very guarded and only serve to make one inquisitive in respect to the real views of the author. All Assyriologists would be pleased to have a plain and concise statement of his *present* views on this question.

Another point, going hand in hand with the preceding, may be noticed, viz.: that the author explains as good Semitic many words hitherto regarded as loan-words. Nothing else could be expected, after the remarks made above. A ba is placed under the stem אִבָּה, and translated "Secretär," with the additional remark that there is no doubt that it is "gutsemitisch." Abkallu, with less emphasis, however, is also regarded as a good Semitic word—contrary to Haupt, who takes it as a loan-word—composed of ab + kallum, cf. pp. 32, 33. The author's treatment of abarakku, abrakku (pp. 69, 70) is new and interesting. On p. 72, the expressions bîti abtu, Tig. vi. 99 = "mein zerstörtes Haus" and ab-ta-a-ti, Neb. Bors. ii. 10, = "die zu Grunde gegangenen," are explained by placing abtu and abtâti under the root אִבָּה. Mr. Smith¹ in "The Borsippa Inscription of Nebuchadnezzar," along with a multitude of other false derivations, says: "This certainly means 'stories.' I think the root is פִּתַּח." He had evidently paid but little attention to Delitzsch's *Assyrisches Woerterbuch* before writing this article (it appeared in July, about two weeks before the review in the Academy) or he would have noticed the derivation given by Delitzsch. Cf. also *Assyr. Woerterbuch*, p. 109. Agurru from a stem אָגַר "to surround." Delitzsch distinguishes two agurru's (as he had already done in his "Vorlesungen"), viz: agurru, i. = "Umschliessung," "Einfassung," "Umkleidung," and agurru, ii. = "baked clay," "bricks," always used collectively.

On pp. 119, 120, new light is thrown on the difficult word adaguru which occurs in Nimrod Epos xi. 149. Cf. also êdlu from the stem אָדַל, instead of êtlu, pp. 150, sqq.

Many more interesting words and references could be cited, but lack of space forbids. In conclusion, it may be said that the first *Lieferung* contains even more material than could have been expected. The typographical execution is splendid. It is a monumental work and deserves the kind attention of all Semitic students. Many will not be able to agree with the author in all that he says, but all will recognize the hand of a master in this book. That the author's life may be prolonged until he brings this—his life's work—to completion should be the earnest wish of every Semitic student.

ROBERT F. HARPER,
Yale University.

TABEAU COMPARE DES ECRITURES BABYLONIENNE ET ASSYRIENNE.*

The body of the very useful and much needed work before us consists of a syllabary giving the archaic and the various modern forms of two hundred and ninety-six characters, to which, in a supplement, eleven are added, making a total

¹ In the *Babylonian and Oriental Record*, July, 1887.

* A. Amiaud et L. Méchineau, **TABEAU COMPARE DES ECRITURES BABYLONIENNE ET ASSYRIENNE ARCHAÏQUES ET MODERNES AVEC CLASSEMENT DES SIGNES D'APRES LEUR FORME ARCHAÏQUE**. Paris: Leroux. 1887. 12fr.

of three hundred and seven numbers. The archaic forms occurring on the monuments discovered in the plains of Chaldæa by de Sarzec are taken as a basis, and for the first time appear classified according to a certain system. Underneath the archaic form or forms of each character are ranged, in two parallel columns, the various equivalents in the more modern styles down to the current forms, all the Babylonian styles being to the left of the dividing line and the Assyrian to the right, the distinct forms in each column being further subdivided according to their derivation from the assumed prototype. This plan of arrangement, for obvious reasons, is an exceedingly convenient one. In this way the confusion to the eye is avoided which would result from a *single* array of signs, and the detection of a desired character is greatly facilitated, while, at the same time, the comparison between the Babylonian and Assyrian forms being at command, a survey of the entire field can be more readily obtained. Reference to cuneiform inscriptions are given for every single form, with the exception of the current Assyrian and Babylonian ones (which close the list under each number), where, of course, no references are required. In fifty-five instances (out of the three hundred and seven numbers) the archaic forms have not yet been found on the monuments, and have therefore been conjecturally constructed; but only when it has been possible to decompose the modern form into its parts, and when, for these parts, archaic equivalents exist, have the conscientious authors ventured to supply missing links in the chain. On the other hand, in twenty-five cases, our authors have not succeeded in assimilating the archaic form to a modern equivalent; and in six cases the assimilation is marked as uncertain. Following the syllabary comes a table of the numerals in the Gudea inscriptions, also with the Babylonian and Assyrian forms, and upon these, two lists, in modern Assyrian characters, arranged in the usual order, the first of which contains such signs as are referred to in the syllabary, together with the number under which they are to be found, and the second, those that are not, the two together forming, as the preface assures us, a complete index of the cuneiform signs at present known.

We should have liked to have seen a third list added, giving the old Babylonian forms with their equivalents in the current Assyrian style, for the benefit of those who are passing from the latter to the study of the former, and perhaps even a fourth list giving a similar arrangement of the characters in the modern Babylonian style might not have been superfluous.

An important and curious fact results from a study of the development of the cuneiform system such as is now, thanks to Messrs. Amiaud and Méchineau, placed within easy range of every student.

There was nothing which, in the early days of the decipherment, puzzled scholars so much and served to cast such suspicion in "lay" circles upon the results reached by the decipherers, as the *polyphonic* character of the signs. How was it possible, it was asked, that a *single* character should have the values "uš" and "nit," or "kal," "dan," "rib" and "lab"? We have long since ceased to wonder at this. It is rather the poly-ideographic character of the signs that may now more justly call forth our surprise. The association due to synonymy, or similarity of ideas, is of course the most important factor in accounting for the various significations which a character has acquired. In this way the sign which means *strong* is also used for the synonyms of *strong*; that for *mouth* may designate *face*, *countenance*, hence *form*, as well as to *speak*, *command* and *word* or *order*. A second factor is the association due to similarity of *sound*, to which the reviewer

recently called attention in a paper read before the American Oriental Association.¹ According to this principle identity or similarity in sound leads to the employment of a sign to express objects not otherwise related. Thus the character which, as an ideogram, has the value "libittu" *brick*, is extended to "lipittu" *fence*; and in the same way, merely through closeness of sound, "tukultu" *help* and "takiltu" *apparition*, are brought together; and many more the like

A third factor which is now, by the "Tableau Comparé," placed beyond doubt, is the *fusion* of two, and in some cases of three, signs, originally distinct, into one. Messrs. Amiaud and Méchineau call attention to eight cases where this process has taken place. The sign, for instance, which has the phonetic values "uš" and "nit" (No. 137 of Delitzsch's "Schrifttafel") has two entirely distinct archaic prototypes. Now we know that "uš" is the "Sumero-Akkadian" for Assyrian "zikaru" *male*, and "nit," an abbreviation of "nita" or "nitaḥ," is the equivalent of "ridû" *stream, effusion*. There seems to be no connection whatever between these two terms; but on the assumption that the one of the archaic prototypes represents "uš" and the second "nit," and that it is merely by the flowing together of the two *forms* in the modern styles that the two terms have been thrown together, the difficulty is cleared away. The same applies to "bar" and "maš" (No. 47 of the "Schrifttafel"), for which again there exist two archaic forms. The sign "šar," "ḫir," etc. (No. 111), presents an interesting feature. While in the modern Babylonian there has taken place a fusion of only two forms, in the current Assyrian the process has gone still further and a third form, for which as yet a separate character is to be found in the former, has in the latter been thrown together with the other two. But the most interesting of the instances cited is that of "ku," etc. (No. 288), which reverts to no less than four archaic forms.

On the other hand, and as a kind of compensation, we find at least one instance where the contrary seems to have taken place, and signs are *differentiated* in modern styles which in older types are not distinguished. In the case of Nos. 215 and 219 (according to the "Schrifttafel") the further back we go, the less differences do they show, and in some of the Nebuchadnezzar texts there is practically none at all; so that, although the archaic form for the latter has not yet been found, it is very probable, as our authors say, that the two descend from "a single and common primitive form." But even if this be not admitted, the forms must have been so alike as to have been mistaken for one another. In no better way can we account for the fact that the latter has so many phonetic values, "bir," "pir," "laḥ" and "liḥ," in common with the former, and is furthermore used to express such ideas as "namaru" *to be bright* and "nuru" *light*. The sign, as is known, also designates "šabu" *warrior* and "ummānu" *army*, with a corresponding phonetic value "šab" (whence "šap" and "zab"); and if we may be permitted to venture a further conjecture, it is that, in the latter sense, the sign is an abbreviation of "SAB" and "ZUN." A parallel instance would be No. 288, which in the sense of "šubatu," "nalbašu" *dress*, seems to be an abbreviation of No. 291.²

MORRIS JASTROW, JR.,
University of Pennsylvania.

¹ Proceedings for May, 1887, pp. 18-22. See also Zimmern, "Busspsalmen," p. 6.

² In the "clothing" list, V R. 14, 15, Nos. 288 and 291 are used interchangeably as determinatives.